

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 12-15 and 18-22 are now in the application. Claims 12-15 and 18-22 are subject to examination. Claim 12 has been amended. Claim 16 has been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12 and 19-22 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0042485 A1 to Gettala et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,255 B2 to Roy under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 12 has been amended to better define the invention. Support for the changes can be found by referring to the specification at paragraph [0028], lines 1-7, and to previously presented claim 17.

According to Gettala “the first link (link A) deemed available is selected for activation”, (cf. paragraph [0020], lines 11-18) and is activated by an activation message sent (over link A) from the Media Gateway to the Media Gateway Controller. After the successful activation, the Media Gateway is registered with the Media Gateway Controller upon the granting of a service change request message that is sent (over link A) from the call control process of the Media Gateway to the call control process of the Media Gateway Controller (Cf. paragraph [0020], lines 10-18).

In the case of a failure of the active link (link A), the standby link (link B) is activated by an activation message from the Media Gateway to the Media Gateway Controller and activation acknowledgement message from the Media Gateway Controller to the Media Gateway and gets ready to carry higher level process messages, which may begin with a service change request to the Media Gateway controller (Cf. paragraph [0027], lines 12-19).

Consequently according to the teaching of Gettala only 1 registration by the Media Gateway exists at a time.

Gettala does not disclose or suggest, that there exists a registration related to link A and a registration related to link B at the same time. In particular by considering the teaching in Gettala, one of ordinary skill in the art would not obtain a teaching or a suggestion for said registrations to be substantially simultaneous.

Roy deals with a H.323 mobility architecture for terminal, user and service mobility. Registration of endpoints occurs before any calls are attempted. Also according to Roy, an endpoint (for example a gateway) only registers with a single Gatekeeper. (Cf. col. 31, lines 43-44). Consequently according to Roy for a given endpoint / media gateway, there is only one registration at a time.

The limitations of previously presented claim 17 have been added to claim 12. In the rejection of claim 17 that follows, the Examiner rejected the claim over Gettala et al., Roy and Sen. The Examiner referred to Box 2202 and Box 2204 in Fig 22a, which

are allegedly shown in Sen, to support the allegation that there would have been a suggestion for substantially simultaneous registrations. However, it is clear that Boxes 2202 and 2204 are not part of the disclosure of Sen, but rather are shown in Fig 22a of Roy.

Roy teaches that a fixed terminal with a multipoint controller functionality and a mobile entity may be registered at the home gatekeeper GK1. However, the fixed terminal and the mobile entity are different endpoints with their own call control entities that naturally are able to be registered at the Gatekeeper GK1 at the same time, in order to initiate and receive calls.

Roy does not teach or suggest that there exists a first registration and at the same time a second registration of a single endpoint / media gateway. By considering the teaching in Roy, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have obtained a suggestion that said registrations defined in claim 12 should be substantially simultaneous.

As already submitted, due to such registrations of the devices during the power-on of the gateway, the present invention enables, e.g., in case of a device failure, a fast and efficient switch-over from one device to the other device. The user does not have to wait until a passive device becomes active. This effect is most efficiently achieved via said early, e.g., simultaneous, registrations with both devices. Hence, one device is ready to substitute the other device in a fast way without any significant delay that can be perceived by the user. Such a seamless transition between the devices is important for

services, e.g. streaming video applications, which do not tolerate any noticeable interruption or disturbance.

The teaching of Roy is directed to a registration (singular) to be provided prior to a call attempt. This is a necessity; otherwise no call could be processed. Instead, the purpose of the registrations according to the current invention is different: The registrations are provided for an efficient swapping between the devices and the assigned links at any time. Hence, if one device or link fails, the other device and link is up and running and can easily enter its active mode. The motivation for doing such multiple registrations due to redundancy purposes is not taught or suggested by considering Gettala et al. and Roy.

The Examiner has failed to support the rejection by referring to any portion of Sen. Furthermore, Applicants believe it is clear that Sen does not teach or suggest substantially simultaneous registrations in the sense defined by claim 12.

Applicants believe it is clear that the invention as defined by claim 12 would not have been suggested by considering the teachings in Gettala et al., Roy, and Sen.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 13-15 and 17 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0042485 A1 to Gettala et al. and U.S.

Patent No. 6,775,255 B2 to Roy and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,065,041 B2 to Sen under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As discussed above, the Examiner has failed to support the rejection by referring to any portion of Sen. The Examiner referred to portions of Roy. Furthermore, Applicants believe it is clear that Sen does not teach or suggest substantially simultaneous registrations in the sense defined by claim 12.

Applicants believe that even if it would have been obvious to have combined the cited teachings, the invention as defined by claims 13-15 and 17 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 12 and the teachings in Gettala et al., Roy, and Sen.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 18 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0042485 A1 to Gettala et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,891,833 B1 to Caves et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants believe that even if it would have been obvious to have combined the cited teachings, the invention as defined by claim 18 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 12 and the teaching in Gettala et al.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 12. Claim 12 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 12.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 12-15 and 18-22 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

August 11, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101